

Old Town Neighborhoods Plan

Stakeholder Group Meeting

8/25/16

Feedback on Policies and Evaluation Criteria

- Like the direction you're going with this – a lot of thought put into it.
- 1.2, Page 2 – limit new commercial activity is really important, glad to see it there
- 1.3 Neighborhood identity features – you can feel as you go down Oak or Mountain that you're transitioning into the neighborhood, and it feels good. Don't necessarily need a huge gateway or feature, or an abrupt transition
- Like the “connected” vision, especially enhancing safety across the arterials
 - How will improvements actually happen? We can't rely on redevelopment; it's a built-out neighborhood.
 - What about putting the pedestrian signals on timers instead of activating on a push?
 - The hawk signals seem to do a good job stopping traffic
 - Whedbee and Mulberry – problem intersection; need to adjust timing for crossing
 - Also what about weird offset intersections? Improving those will be expensive. Can look at smaller improvements, but larger shifts would need to be a bigger project/package offer with larger improvements.
 - Maybe future BFO offers, implementation of the Pedestrian Plan
- 2.2 – enhance bike/ped travel along Mulberry and Shields – might cause more problems than it solves on Shields. More interested in a parallel route. Revisit that.
 - I like the idea of the road diet on Shields, want it to be north of Laurel instead of north of Magnolia as currently proposed. I'd say that people could just avoid Shields, but there's no good way to get north-south and I see people on Shields all the time. Need to do something.
- 2.4 – what about people working on homes in RP3 areas? They'll be there more than 2 hours.
 - Homeowner tells the City, and they're usually pretty flexible.
 - Not sure if there really is a good way to deal with commercial work happening in the neighborhoods or service calls.
 - Have run into problems before, program isn't always implemented as it should be.
 - Problem is being created by CSU, Otterbox – but residents are paying for it. Would rather sit down with them and make them fix the problem they're creating. Maybe neighborhood group could bring them to the table, since conversations with the City haven't been very productive. Maybe the neighborhoods should organize.
 - There have been so many meetings in parallel, and it's a tough issue. Everyone is doing the best they can to try to come up with good solutions – no one wants their streets to be clogged up with cars and no place to park.
 - Consider new language for action on page 4 – include something about reducing impact on residents. Policy to develop procedure for resolving parking conflicts between neighborhoods and businesses/CSU. Include CSU in addition to Downtown.

- Proposed language: “Residents support CSU, larger employers, and Downtown businesses implementing stronger incentives for students and employees to use sustainable alternative forms of transportation to alleviate parking problems in the neighborhoods.”
- CSU build car storage?
- 4.3 – Design standards – are they only going to be guidelines?
 - Yes. Only guidelines. We don’t really address architectural style, but do try to encourage compatible massing, articulation, front porches, etc.
 - Concern about having only guidelines, doesn’t fully support the “preserving the character” policies. I don’t see too much of it right now, but I’ve seen it happen before in other neighborhoods. If we don’t have stronger language I’m concerned that we’ll see more modern architecture that doesn’t fit in the neighborhood. At that point it will be too late.
 - In some places (Richmond) you have to get your neighbors’ approval for your house plans.
 - Property rights is a strong idea in Fort Collins, more restrictive policies don’t always go over very well.
 - Encourage cooperation with neighbors – maybe add some language to encourage people to work with each other?
 - Could we include language saying “when contractors re-up, they get a copy of the guidelines” – licenses issued or renewed. Realtor education would also be good. Front counter/development review. “Neighborhood supports education and promotion of design guidelines”
 - Expedited process for permits that are “pre-approved” or follow the guidelines? Cheaper permit? Rebate approved by LPC?
- 4.1 – why doesn’t this policy include the design guidelines? They should be mentioned here too.
- 4.4 – Don’t want to see any changes to the lot size and FAR standards. We fought hard for that.
 - Issue with homeowners not living in the home.
 - Don’t want them to be converted into vacation/short term rentals.

Key Implementation Actions

- Design guidelines
- Westside rezoning
- ADU standards
- Transition area (NCB) standards
- Shields/Mulberry restriping and bike/ped improvements
- Magnolia greenway improvements
- Intersection/sidewalk improvements

Non-implementation actions

- No neighborhood-wide zoning

- No changes to 2013 Design Standards
- No significant NCL changes (e.g. duplexes)
- No short-term rental standards (Citywide conversation)
- No major parking changes (rely on existing programs)
- No new historic district designations

- What about the notch of Downtown zoning between Oak and Mountain? Could be 5-6 stories, and it is a neighborhood fight waiting to happen.
 - Policy language – want NCB zoning where it doesn't currently exist
 - Encourage discussion between property owners of D lots and neighbors adjacent to D zoning where NCB doesn't currently exist to create compatible projects
 - Policy language – transitions from downtown to residential

- As neighborhoods become more dense, impacts from wood smoke, noise, and other nuisances become worse.
 - Look for areas to add “and human health” in sustainability policies in addition to environmental protection
 - Recognizing there's a carrying capacity for the neighborhoods (dog barking, lights, etc.)
 - Add “enforcement” where appropriate

- Add something about civility or neighborliness in livability policies.

- ADUs
 - Support lots eligible for 1 ADU only
 - Attached ADU occupancy requirement – no more than 3 unrelated in the entire structure, maybe 4 – a further restriction on occupancy limits.
 - Support owner-occupancy requirement for the main house
 - Attached ADU seems really close to a duplex, concerns about that
 - Concerns about code enforcement, especially if more ADUs and more residents